

JOINT CAPITAL BUDGET MEETING

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, HIGHER EDUCATION AND ENERGY

VETERANS AND SENIORS

Minutes

The special joint Economic Development, Higher Education & Energy Committee and Veterans & Seniors Capital Budget Meeting was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, Smithtown, New York, on **May 24th, 2005**, to discuss the matter of the Capital Budget.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Legislator Lynne Nowick • Chairperson/Economic Development
Legislator Angie Carpenter • Vice•Chair/Economic Development
Legislator Jay Schneiderman • Member/Economic Development
Legislator Brian Foley • Member/Economic Development.
Legislator Cameron Alden • Member/Economic Development•Vets & Seniors
Legislator John Kennedy • Chairman/Veterans & Seniors
Legislator Elie Mystal • Member/Veterans & Seniors

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Legislator Jon Cooper • Member/Economic Development•Vets & Seniors
Legislator Daniel Losquadro • Member/Veterans & Seniors

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Legislator David Bishop • District # 14
Legislator Peter O'Leary • District #3

Legislator William Lindsay • District #8
Legislator Ricardo Montano • District #9
Mea Knapp • Counsel to the Legislature
Jim Spero • Director/Budget Review Office
Gail Vizzini • Deputy Director/Budget Review Office
Joe Muncey • Budget Review Office
Sandy Sullivan • Chief Deputy Clerk/Suffolk County Legislature
Jim Morgo • Commissioner/Economic Development and Workforce Housing
Carolyn Fahey • Economic Development & Workforce Housing
Ed Hogan • Aide to Legislator Nowick
Fran Seims • Aide to Presiding Officer Caracappa

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Donna Catalano • Court Stenographer

(*THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 1:12 P.M.*)

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Good afternoon. We will start this Capital Budget Meeting. We'll start with the Pledge to the Flag started by Legislator Foley.

SALUTATION

Welcome, everybody. Mr. Morgo, do you want to come up?

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Hi. How are you?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Good afternoon. How are you?

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Okay. Tell us what we need to hear.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Good afternoon, Madam Chairwoman and members of the committee. I would like to just touch on a couple of Capital Projects that involve Economic Development and Workforce Housing and just clarify a couple of things and then answer any of the questions you may have.

First of all on 6411, this is the Capital Project involving infrastructure improvements for workforce homes. And there is only one clarification I want to make with •• in regards to the report by the Budget Review Office, and there was wording that the funds could be used for improvements such as public sewers, public water mains or road improvements. I just want to emphasize such as •• there are other infrastructure needs that developments will often have, particularly downtown redevelopment, and that's demolition and the cost of disposal of those materials. That would also be included under infrastructure. That is the only clarification I wanted to make there, okay?

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

The other I wanted to •• and I'm glad to see Legislator O'Leary here, although he's not paying attention to me. Good afternoon.

LEG. O'LEARY:

On occasion I do, Jim. Only if it's important to us.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

It depends on the setting. The Capital Program 6420, involving the study for the development of County•owned land in Yaphank. And I was hoping, and he is on his way, I know, that Tom Isles of our Planning Department would be here. This •• this smart planning will guarantee a smart development. And one of the things that I wanted to congratulate Legislator O'Leary for was having the foresight to come up with Yaphank Center Development Panel, so that we will during this •• our planning process, oversee the best use of the Yaphank Development.

One of the things that BRO mentions is that land use study that was called for by an Executive Order for the end of March was not issued as of yet. That is incorrect. It is completed. It was completed on March 31st, and we will be glad to share it with all of the members of the Legislature. That's all I want to say about that one.

Finally, there are two Capital Projects for both the traditional downtown revitalization program and the special targeted downtowns that you accepted last year. I'd like Carolyn Fahey to talk about those.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Which projects?

MS. FAHEY:

6412 and 6418. 6412 is the traditional program where the funding grants are recommended by the Citizens Advisory Panel. We are through round four. This year's Capital Program includes 500,000 for round five. The Citizens Advisory Panel is in the process of revising the application, so we anticipate the grant announcement to go out next month for round five.

There is one notation in the Budget Review Office's review that on page 384 talks about the creation of the Citizens Advisory Panel and that it had a deadline for December 31st of '97 for a written report. It goes on to say that the report has not yet been submitted. That's incorrect. The report was submitted in March of '98, which I have a copy if the Legislators would like one. So it was submitted in March of '98. The Citizens Advisory Panel has been reestablished and kept alive every year to review recommendations for funding. Right now that's their primary purpose, to review recommendations for funding that has been adopted and then to be a think tank and a resource for each other for programs and projects in their downtowns.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Legislator Carpenter.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Before we move off that project, it's my understanding that there's been a change in the focus of the Citizens Advisory Panel as far as funding projects, and I would ask that you speak to that issue.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Legislator Carpenter, it was a decision of the •• of the panel to go back to the actual past of the panel where it was that the •• the funding would be for significant projects that would be able to leverage other funds. It seems that over the years there's been a sprinkling of the funds, and someone said during one of the meetings that they were given one•eighteenth, in other words, every Legislator would get one•eighteenth of the funding. That, in fact, was not the case. There would be funds going to five or six different projects in each Legislative district. Consequently, when you have a limited amount of funds and you have five in each Legislator's district, that would be 90 different projects. And some of them were very significant and some of them leveraged other funds and had a meaningful impact on the downtowns.

Unfortunately, some of them were, and I don't mean this literally, I mean it figuratively, some were just window dressing. So after considerable discussion and •• I wouldn't call it debate, I would call it considerable dialog back and forth among the folks on the Citizens Advisory Panel, it was decided that there would be a new grading system, a new application and the panel members would endeavor to rate the submitted applications as to about five different criteria judging on their overall impact on specific downtowns.

LEG. CARPENTER:

The Citizens Advisory Panel, do they keep minutes of their meetings?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Yes.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Are they routinely shared with the Legislature?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

I don't know if they are, but they certainly can be.

LEG. CARPENTER:

I think that would be important, because I know that the members of the panel are appointed by the Legislature, and it would be a good way to keep that line of communication open.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

One of the things I asked for, Legislator, is that the first two be sent to the Legislature, so you should have received them or be receiving them. There's only been three meetings. The first two, the minutes are completed.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Well, I don't know about anyone else, but I don't recall seeing any minutes of the advisory panel.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Carolyn tells that they went to Bill Faulk of the Presiding Officer's Office.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Also, too, it would be helpful, I think, to have an updated list of the members of the panel, because I do know that there have been some new appointments ••

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Not a problem.

LEG. CARPENTER:

•• to the panel. All right? Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Legislator Bishop.

LEG. BISHOP:

I was, I believe, the author of the Downtown Revitalization Bill when we first established it. And just by way of background, just so you understand how convoluted our process was, it was supposed to be a community idea endorsed by a local government as a partner, so there were three partners and the County would be the last part, and it had to be ratified by this 18 member panel. And the agreement among Legislators at that time was, yes, everybody is going to get one•eighteenth, everyone was going to participate, which is a little awkward because we had some Legislators, like Legislator Binder, who really didn't have a downtown. But that was the way it was felt it was necessary to achieve the program. So now the program is more mature and you want to make changes to it and so on. But I think that it is incumbent upon the Legislature and the Executive Branch, if we're going to make changes, to have a new authorization bill with the rules of how it's going to work from this point forward. Because I don't think it has any authorization for a second downtown program, which targets larger amounts to a few districts, right? Where is that coming from? That's just an executive initiative.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

That's right.

LEG. BISHOP:

Which, you know, I would support, but it doesn't mean that it's •• I think you need an authorizing bill in order to carry it forward.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Let me just back •• a couple of things. I assume that you all realize that even after the recommendations of the Citizens Advisory Panel, it is you who decides where the funds go. The

second thing is it was my understanding that in the original legislation where we were going now, this was the intent that there would be all •• decided by the panel with the ratification of the Legislature, but they would have to be things that would meaningfully attract folks to the downtown, stimulate the economic development of downtowns.

The other thing that's fairly new, certainly new since my time on the horseshoe, was the omnibus resolutions and the member item resolutions in even some of the cultural arts grants. Those were distributed among the panel members, not all of them, just for the ones in their particular district to give some perspective. In fact, it's a double edged sword. In a way those are good, because those are leveraging on other money. In another way, you can say, well, you don't want to see groups double dipping.

LEG. BISHOP:

Right. Leveraging money was always contemplated beginning, but the equal shares, you know, it may strike you as wasteful or whatever, but that was always the understanding at least on this side of the street of how the program was going to work. And if you want to change that, then I think we need to •• you know, maybe it's time, therefore, to have a new authorizing legislation that spells out what the programs are going to be, that there's going to be one that has more money that's targeted to downtowns in distress or specific downtowns, that's the County Executive's new initiative.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Which is separate, which has already been approved.

LEG. BISHOP:

And then a reaffirmation of whatever vision we have for this •• for the existing downtown program, whether it's one•eighteenth or whatever the panel says or however it's going to work. I think, you know, maybe it is time to change that after all. I think what was it, seven or eight years? I think everybody's got their hanging baskets, all the basics are in place.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Just one moment.

LEG. BISHOP:

I'll yield.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Just to interrupt, and I don't mean to interrupt you, Legislator Bishop, because this is basically for Capital Budget Projects. What I would like to do, and this is, I think, a very important subject to discuss, I would like to have possibly the Chairman of the Committee and maybe a few of the members come in before the Economic Development Committee and maybe we could discuss this at a little length, because this is basically for the projects, Capital Projects, but we really need to talk about it. And Legislator Bishop might have the right idea there, there's changes being made without Legislative approval.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

I think it's a good idea.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

I will call your office and arrange maybe for you to come in.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

And I think what Legislator Carpenter originally asked for, we'll not only have the minutes, but all the applications and all of that. I think that's an excellent idea.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Okay. We'll call your office when we get back or tomorrow morning.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Sounds good.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

If it's on the projects, the Capital Projects, we'll ask questions, otherwise the discussion of the ••

LEG. LINDSAY:

It's a Capital Project.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Legislator Montano, on the Capital Projects?

LEG. MONTANO:

Yeah, sort of in the middle. I'll just ask quickly. Jim, these projects, and I'm just •• for background, what do you mean by downtown? Is there a definition somewhere? Is there a list of downtown areas in the County or is this something that we generally •• because I know that in my •• in my district, we generally have two downtown areas. They're not included in the Capital Project that you indicated •• you know, that's indicated here, it's not one of the five listings. But how would you define my downtown areas?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

That's separate. Keep those five •• that's separate. That's the County Executive's initiative. I think Legislator Bishop used the word convoluted in describing some of them. However, Planning has a report on •• and they do define downtown districts. And under the Legislature's program, the applications can be received from Chambers, bids, with the •• somebody said the cooperation of the municipality. So the project can be listed, Central Islip, for example, Brentwood could be listed as a downtown.

LEG. MONTANO:

Do they have these •• just very quickly, do they have these downtown areas broken up by classes, like a Class I or a Class II, or is it just generic?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

It's just generic. But I can get you that report too.

LEG. MONTANO:

Thank you. I appreciate that. I would like to see it.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Questions about the Capital Projects. Legislator Alden, about the Capital Projects?

LEG. ALDEN:

I would just disagree with the Chair, I think that this is exactly the appropriate time to speak about downtown revitalization. There's also five \$50,000 projects that really had no substance to them, the money was just put away. And right now we're discussing whether to borrow money or possibly wait another couple of months and put it in the Operating Budget. I think Dave Bishop •• Legislator Bishop was right on point in exploring whether we want these •• the whole downtown revitalization program in the Capital Budget or whether we want to do it in the Operating Budget again and what shape it's going to be, how the •• you know, I just •• I think that this is the appropriate time to discuss this.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. LINDSAY:

6418, is the County Executive initiative for downtowns, and it's five, right, just the five that are here?

MS. FAHEY:

No. The first round is for five specific projects. The County Executive has requested money next year for additional projects.

LEG. LINDSAY:

So they could go to these areas and not go to others? And the decision that was made about 6412, again, is to more substantial projects, so maybe, like, five projects, is that what you are looking at?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Couple of things. I would disagree with Legislator Alden when he said there was no substance for the five, because they've meeting with the folks from those difference downtowns talking about the County Executive's initiative, just those five. Next year it may be the same if you adopt it or maybe different downtowns, but emphasis was on distressed downtowns.

Second part of your question. I would be astounded if the decision were only for five under the traditional program, only five projects, that would be very surprising to me. Again, it's determined by the panel and the Legislature. That's why when Legislator Nowick suggested that

we come back before an Economic Development Committee, I think that made a lot of sense so that we could give the criteria and there could be a give and take with the panel members and with the Chairman.

LEG. LINDSAY:

But the point that I'm getting at is with the change in criteria to 6412, it seems to me that it's getting closer and closer to 6418, they seem like the same program, but just being decided by a panel rather than the County Executive.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

The County Executive's is for •• specifically only for distressed downtowns. And I can see how you would make that judgement, but it's not correct. As a matter of fact, during the last meeting of the downtown panel, one of the representatives was saying that, well •• and she mentioned the specific downtown, Wyandanch. And she said, "Well, if we're judging it just on need, then it should all go to some place like Wyandanch." And the point was made and a very good point, you're not going to give funds to a downtown that doesn't have the capacity to go on •• not to say that Wyandanch does or doesn't, that's not the point. The point is you go to make the judgment based on specific criteria in the application. And it's •• the County Executive's is specifically for distressed downtowns. That traditional Legislative program is for all downtowns.

LEG. LINDSAY:

But they could be one in the same.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Sure. Sure, but that's unlikely.

LEG. BISHOP:

But where's your definition of distress since it moves year to year? Earlier you said •• I'm sorry. Earlier you said that there are different ••

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Legislator Bishop, I don't want to ignore Legislator Alden who was before you.

LEG. ALDEN:

I'd be perfectly happy to yield to Legislator Bishop.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

That's fine.

LEG. BISHOP:

Earlier you said there was identification of downtowns last year and there are different ones this year in the County Executive's initiative. So is there a criteria for a distressed downtown?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

In the County Executive's initiative, yes.

LEG. BISHOP:

Where would we find that?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

We have that. We have that list that Planning gave us and it's on the Census based on unemployment, people below the poverty level, things like that.

LEG. BISHOP:

Right. Okay. So again, to reiterate what I said earlier, I think that might be a wonderful initiative worthy of Legislative support, but I think there should be some authorization for it, and it might be time to revisit our original downtown program as well.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

You approved the one last year, there's a new one coming to you now.

LEG. BISHOP:

Just a Capital Project, not a downtown •• not a separate downtown program for distressed. What you're doing is you're bringing it in in the Capital Budget and saying approve this.

MS. FAHEY:

It already exists, and you adopted it last year. You adopted funding for five projects underneath 6418 in '04. The first five have already been adopted.

LEG. BISHOP:

In the Capital Budget last year?

MS. FAHEY:

And funded and appropriated last year, right.

LEG. BISHOP:

But there was no presentation to the Legislature of the definition of a distressed and a list of distressed and a programmatic criteria and how it's going to operate ever given to the Legislature. Typically in lawmaking, you know, there's that aspect, an authorization aspect and then there's a separate appropriation aspect, which is what the Capital Project is.

LEG. ALDEN:

You done, Dave? Okay. It's all right, through the Chair, to take my time back then? Maybe I'll stand corrected if you explain to me, last year in the budget, there were five •• well, I guess they identified five downtowns, \$50,000 each, but when I looked to see what projects were in there, there was no project, is that wrong or is that correct?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

There were no projects in there last year.

LEG. ALDEN:

Then there was just money, so there was a \$250,000, you know, overall fund broken into five separate, you know, downtowns ••

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

I wasn't here. Carolyn is saying no.

MS. FAHEY:

This Legislature adopted five separate resolutions amending •• creating that project and giving money for those specific five downtown •• those specific five areas.

LEG. ALDEN:

Right. But when I went to look •• correct me •• there was no project identified with the money.

MS. FAHEY:

The resolutions had not the specific project, the area, yes.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Well, we were saying the same thing, right? You're right.

LEG. ALDEN:

Right. So there's 50,000 to go to Bay Shore, Downtown Bay Shore, downtown revitalization in Bay Shore, but no project, like, it wasn't brick pavers, it wasn't hanging baskets as you said before.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Yep.

LEG. ALDEN:

All right. So I was correct before when I stated that there was basically no projects, it was just money to an area.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Can I then go on?

LEG. ALDEN:

Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Thank you. What happened then is that my department reached out to the five different downtowns and asked for a submission of at least three projects giving them specific criteria, and they came back •• I think all five have come back •• all five come back, and we're now going through the process of awarding the money to whichever of these three processes meet the criteria.

LEG. ALDEN:

Now, when you say reached out, like, what, Chamber of Commerce, citizens groups?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Chamber of Commerce, BID, Community Development. For Bay Shore, for example, Donna _Pericone_ came in.

LEG. ALDEN:

How about the town?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Somebody from •• what's that person's name? Dan somebody from Planning?

LEG. ALDEN:

Dan Gallizio? No. He's over in Brookhaven.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

For now.

LEG. ALDEN:

Another week, right? _Doleman_ That's who we reached out to.

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay. You know, so you allocated the money, then developed the plans afterwards.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Right. But the criteria were there to revitalize the distressed downtowns.

LEG. ALDEN:

Unfortunately, when I went looking for that, I couldn't find that either.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

We can get you that, Cameron.

LEG. ALDEN:

All right.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Actually, we can get you the specific ones that were submitted.

LEG. ALDEN:

That was after the fact. Now I'm starting to see, you know, from some of the groups that they're telling me what they, you know, basically had work with you on. But, you know, I guess I'm more like •• I'd like to see a little more up front ••

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

That's what I thought you were saying.

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Is there anything else? And Legislator Bishop, when they come into the committee, I'll let your office know.

LEG. BISHOP:

Thank you very much. Is that it?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Yes. The only other thing we have is the airport. This is Anthony Ceglio, the manager of the airport.

MR. CEGLIO:

Hi. Tony Ceglio, airport manager at Gabreski Airport. Some of the programs that we're proposing seem very minor compared to what Jim was just talking about, but I'll go over them. If you have any questions, please let me know. Most the them are continuations of previous programs in previous years basically to support the safety, security and operations of the airport. One of the important ones coming up for next year, 5702, which includes renovation and construction of airport facilities. It includes the funding for replacement of underground power lines that are old and dilapidated at the airport. Some of them are in excess of 60 years.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Repeat that number?

MR. CEGLIO:

Excuse me. 5702. Another one, which I believe Carolyn may speak about in a few minutes, 5713, which is industrial park redevelopment, includes three and a half million for infrastructure for development of the industrial park at Gabreski Airport, which includes roadways, utilities, things like that in preparation of the development of the industrial park.

5731, which is an airport obstruction program, currently requesting \$300,000 for a safety program at the airport. There are trees and obstructions that create a line of sight problem for the control tower to certain areas of the airport, approaches to runways and taxiways. So we're looking for funding to ameliorate that problem. 5733 •• and I'm skipping, I'm not going over every one, just some of the important ones. 5733, replacement of the airport maintenance facility at the airport. Again, in anticipation of the industrial park development. Our maintenance facilities are right now in the middle of the proposed industrial park, so we're looking for \$640,000 to replace the maintenance facility to be located outside the proposed industrial park area.

The one new project we're asking for, down towards the bottom, 5737, airport snow removal equipment for safety at the airport. Currently, we rely heavily on the Air National Guard to assist us because we have a minimal amount of equipment to clear the snow from the operational surfaces. So we have requested funding from the Federal Aviation Administration, and we're looking for the matching funds for that snow removal equipment.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Madam Chair. Just a quick question. You are seeking 450,000 for snow removal. I recall that we had a resolution before us, I think it was earlier in the year, to acquire a piece of equipment, a used piece of equipment for 250,000. Is the Guard no longer interested in doing snow removal? I'm just curious why we're ramping up.

MR. CEGLIO:

Okay. Well, the used piece of equipment actually was for three thousand, not 250. No, the Guard actually is responsible for plowing two of the runways at the airport. Right now, the airport plows the remaining taxiways and one other runway. We don't have the equipment to adequately do the taxiways at this point, so we rely heavily on the Guard to help us out once they're finished with their responsibilities. So we're not ramping up, we're just getting up to speed the way I see it.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Also, it seems like you are doing a variety of improvements to the interior, the counters and things like that. I'm just •• I'm not that familiar with the airport. Do we have any kind of consistent commercial carriers in there or is it just basically recreational traffic and things like that?

MR. CEGLIO:

Basically recreational traffic, there's no scheduled air carrier service at the airport.

LEG. KENNEDY:

And is there any intention to seek that or solicit it?

MR. CEGLIO:

No. Not at this point.

LEG. KENNEDY:

But you have charter services that you run?

MR. CEGLIO:

There are charter services that come in and out of the airport. It's not run by any one company, it's run by a number of different companies. The airport is a public•used general aviation airport. Just like it said, it's open to public 24 hours a day, seven days a week. So any corporate aircraft that wants to come in, a charter corporate aircraft that wants to come in can come in, and they do frequently, especially in the summer.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay.

MR. CEGLIO:

My Commissioner just mentioned, if anybody •• I think I've mentioned this probably before, if anybody would like to come out and take a tour of the airport just to get up to speed on what we have out there and what we need to do, please feel free to give me a call, and I'll be happy to do that at any time.

LEG. KENNEDY:

One last question, I guess, and this might shift left a little bit. The industrial park, the planned construction as far as the industrial park goes at the airport, I guess I'd ask the same thing, that's a substantial investment, three and a half million dollars, obviously you've got an expression of interest or a solicitation at this point of businesses that are •• have expressed a desire to locate?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Let me take that, Legislator. There's, like everything else in government, a process. The process is finally moving along. We are now waiting for the Town of Southampton to present us with their master plan for the Airport Planned Development District, as we call it, APDD, which talks about the type of entities we are looking to submit responses to a Request For Proposal. We are going to have •• when I say we, Economic Development•Workforce Housing, is going to have an RFP prepared for the end of the summer for interested businesses.

We have had many, many inquires, and not based on any set criteria or any master plan, just based on, you know, kind of knee jerk reactions; some are very appropriate. One of the things that the County Executive and the Town Supervisor Heaney talked about is creating a homeland security hub, a defense sector industrial hub. Congressman King and Senator Balboni have been working with us to have a down•state homeland security park there.

So there will be a process, there will be responses to an RFP for businesses, entities that want to locate. It's only 48 acres unfortunately. The industrial park is 58 acres, but when you take away the infrastructure it's only 48 acres. So we're not talking about a very large expanse, but it's sewerred, there are sewers there.

One of the things I might suggest again on the theme that Legislator Nowick mentioned earlier about talking about the downtowns at an Economic Development Committee, I would think it would be a good idea if the committee ever wanted to hold a meeting out at Gabreski. And we'd be able •• and again, everybody would be welcome. And we could talk about •• we could not only talk about, we could illustrate what's been done so far, we can share the master plan, we could give the maps. You'd be right there and you could see what is going on.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Actually, I'm just writing a note to myself, too, to follow up on that meeting out there.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Jim, just two more quick questions on that, and this goes back to a prior life many years ago when I sat on CEQ. I know that there are a number of leases that were left there at the airport. As a matter of fact, it was for a variety of different types of operations; furniture stripping, storage, equipment. And there was a communal septic system in place at that point that contributed towards, I guess, some of the groundwater pollution. Also, there was a contamination from when the Guard had it, I guess, there was a plume out there. In the ten years, I guess, since I've been involved with that, has that all changed? Now it's all sewerred?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

It's all sewerred. There is still a small contaminated area out on it, but that's going to be cleaned up.

LEG. KENNEDY:

That's what they told us ten years ago.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

I know that, John, but we are moving •• you know, it's •• I don't want to •• I want to be diplomatic here, but the management and the direction of Gabreski needed improvement and we are moving in that direction, and we're doing it through a process and through a plan.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. But you do not have those individual septic systems anymore, nor would you ••

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Oh, no.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

No. No. And the Sewer Agency talked about forming a new County sewer district at its last meeting, which will necessarily cause an upgrade of the Yaphank sewer •• I meant Gabreski.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Legislator Alden.

LEG. ALDEN:

Jim, just a follow up. You said you had a master plan. The last one I saw was probably about three years old, and it was, like, a business plan slash master plan. Yours is completely new from that?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Completely. Tony is working on •• which is different from what I talked about •• Tony is working on a general overall airport master plan, which the emphasis is on aviation. The town is working on a development •• planned development district for the airport.

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay. I think it would be appropriate, too, at this point, especially if you have a draft of that. If you could get it out to us as quickly possible, because some of the things we have to vote on right now for the Capital Budget are •• in my mind, would be dependant on what your business plan is or your master plan for the airport, including time frames and things of that nature. So I think it would be, you know, like, critical actually to see that even if it's a draft form.

MR. CEGLIO:

That's exactly what it is, it's in draft. I just made some final comments to the consultant that's preparing it. I'd like to get a chance to review the comments that I made, make sure they're corrected and then we should be able to get you out something.

LEG. ALDEN:

Before we vote on this, you think, or?

MR. CEGLIO:

What's the time frame?

LEG. ALDEN:

Fairly tight.

MR. CEGLIO:

I guess we could send the draft without my final review on it, if you'd like.

LEG. ALDEN:

I think that would be critical. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

With that caveat.

LEG. ALDEN:

Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Yes. Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. LINDSAY:

I want to go back to 5713 again, 3.8 million for infrastructure improvement. Once that infrastructure is made, we intend to lease the 58 acres to different •• but it's a lease, it's not a sale, we're not selling the property there?

MS. FAHEY:

We can't sell the property.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Okay. I assume that the lease rates will be, you know, market value that we'll be able to recoup our infrastructure improvements.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Legislator, we just had a meeting last week on more up•to•date appraisals to make the comparables more accurate than they formally were. Some of the lease rates out in the airport were, frankly, ridiculously low, and that's part of the whole process. Just one clarification, and again, you know, I've spoken on the record a lot and I know how you can get into trouble sometimes, so let me make a qualification. Theoretically, you could have, and I'm underlining, theoretically, you could have one entity take the entire 48 acres, you know, if it were a major defense contract or homeland security. I don't know if you would have, you know, many more than tops 20 I think, that would be tops of what you would have, I would think. But the infrastructure improvements you're not going to get them without roads and ways to get into the park.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Okay. Any other questions? All righty. With that, we will bring up ••

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

•• the representatives from the college.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Hi. How are you?

MR. DEMAYO:

Good afternoon, everyone. Thanks for the opportunity to speak today. My name is John DeMayo, to my right is Paul Cooper with the Community College.

I want to touch on a few highlights of the Capital Program. In general, we wanted to comment first that our main drive was to maintain the Capital Projects from last year's program and this year's program. And we are very happy to read the independent study conducted by the Legislative Budget Review Office and was encouraged by their support of those existing Capital Projects.

In addition to that, we have one new project, Project 2138, to bring air conditioning to two buildings on the Ammerman Campus that are without it; namely, the Riverhead Building and Southampton. That was our lone new project, and again, we're happy to have support of that from the Budget Review Office. In addition we have a fire sprinkler infrastructure project, Project 2129, which as it stood, allowed us to, in the future, bring fire sprinklers to building on the Ammerman Campus that currently didn't have them.

The Budget Review Office report has added to that project to include funds, which they got cost estimates from us, so that in the future we can sprinkle those buildings that are currently not on the Ammerman Campus. And we appreciate that recommendation as well.

As far as maintaining the program that was adopted last year and this year, there were five projects that were deleted in the Executive's proposed budget and two projects that were

delayed. We'd just like to talk about them briefly. The first two projects that were deleted was new library at the Eastern Campus, and then separately the subsequent renovation of the Peconic Building at the Eastern Campus where the current library resides. Those numbers are •

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

2181 and 2189.

MR. DEMAYO:

2189 is the library and 2181 is the Peconic Building renovation. It's important to note that these two projects currently have 50% state share. They're in the current five year program with the state. They have been in our Capital Program for some time. We certainly don't want to lose the opportunity to move forward with these projects otherwise we'll lose that state share. In addition, the Eastern Campus lack of a true library has been a sore point with accreditation organization, Middle States, and it's certainly something we want to maintain in the Capital Program.

In addition, there are two other projects that currently have state share, Project 2192, which improves college entrances to the Ammerman Campus, and Project 2170, which repairs the existing tennis courts on the Ammerman Campus. Both these projects were included in the Executive's proposed budget, but construction was delayed to subsequent years on both. We feel it's important to restore the timing of those funds. On the college entrance project, there's a separate project to improve traffic conditions on Nicolls Road, a federally funded project. And we timed our funds or requested the timing so we wouldn't be doing things twice. So any improvements we made at our entrances that border Nicholls Road, would meld well with the improvements that DPW will recommend as part of their project.

And insofar as the tennis courts are concerned, they're in pretty significant disarray. And once the study is completed to determine the best solution to the reoccurring cracking and damage to the surfaces that make the courts virtually unplayable, we would want to move forward with construction immediately after that to avoid any safety concerns that are obvious there.

The final •• or the next two projects that were also removed the, the Learning Resource Center on the Grant Campus, Project 2159, and the new gymnasium on the Eastern Campus, Project 2120. These projects are awaiting state aid, however, as the BRO report summarized and we know full well, it's important for us to show support for these projects now, otherwise there is no chance for the state coming through with their 50% share for these projects. So even though we've only asked for them to be included in subsequent years, clearly including them there sends a signal to the state that we support these projects and puts us in a position to solicit funds from them. And that has been critical in the past for any Capital Project that we receive state share on.

And the final project that was affected in this year's proposed budget from the Executive was the dormitory study project, Project 2112, which was planning money to determine the feasibility and need for dormitory housing on any of our three campuses. It's a project we know had Legislative interest, our president supports it, and she's seen problems with that close to her. It was anticipated this year, the college submitted an appropriating resolution in February to have those funds allocated, and at this time has not received word of that resolution moving forward.

We know that the Budget Review Office has some alternative funding sources including the College's reserve as a recommendation. We have to think about that and consider that moving forward. However, those are the main projects that we simply want restored to their funding status and their schedule that was in the adopted program that this Legislature approved last year. If there are any questions about those specifically.

LEG. ALDEN:

Madam Chairwoman.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

What was the project number for the dormitories?

MR. DEMAYO:

Project 2112.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

2112. Okay. While I'm looking at it, Legislator Carpenter.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Yes, thank you. Thank you so much for coming down and giving that overview. I have to tell you I was on the Ammerman Campus Sunday, and I know Legislator Foley was there also, and it was very, I guess, heartwarming is not a bad word to use, because we did see the fruits of some of the labor of the Legislature, in particular the Education Committee, in some of the Capital Project having been done over the past years. But it really is just a baby step. There still remains a lot to be done.

The inclusion of the library and the recreation center at the Eastern Campus is so very important. And I would just like to remind everyone that the president was here, and I know the Faculty Association also spoke to this issue, how important it is in the accreditation process that these projects remain, that we show our commitment to them. We are just in the beginning

phases of the reaccreditation process. And I know that there is a County •• a college•wide committee that's already met. They take this very seriously. The accreditation does not happen until 2007, but that's how important is, you know, they're already working on it now. So these projects have to stay in there, because at the last reaccreditation, this was cited as an area where we were woefully lacking.

To the dorm study, I was very distressed to hear that the college had sent over the necessary paperwork back in February and the County Executive's Office has not acted on the appropriating resolution. I have asked Budget Review and Legislative Counsel to draft that appropriating resolution so that we can move forward with it. I know that there's been an awful lot of participation and interest in that that study, not only with the college, but the business sector and other colleges, because they're looking at it as a way of not only looking at the need for dorms, but also perhaps faculty or workforce housing for us, which we all know is so, so sorely lacking. So again, I just want to thank you and let you know that we are moving forward with that appropriating resolution.

MR. DEMAYO:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Is there anybody else with any •• Legislator Alden. No more questions? Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Just a couple of quick questions about the library at the Eastern Campus. That's what, Project 2189?

MR. DEMAYO:

Correct.

LEG. KENNEDY:

In your write up you cite that there's a 22.5% increase in student population.

MR. DEMAYO:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

What does that translate to? How many students are we talking about approximately?

MR. DEMAYO:

I'll see if I have that.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Well, I'm just curious if you can frame it as far as the numbers go. And, I guess, the other

question I would ask is I know that you have a project now to construct a culinary institute on Main Street in Riverhead; is that correct?

MR. DEMAYO:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Does that building have some kind of a library component with it or will you look at students there utilizing this library? Have you looked at that as far as any kind of interconnection?

MR. DEMAYO:

I don't believe the construction of the Culinary Arts Program includes space for a library. To your first question, the increase in enrollment, the campus was roughly, if I was to pick a number, 2000 students in enrollment, and that has gone up, again, two, 300 students over the past five years.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So approximately at this point, you service about 2500 students on the campus?

MR. DEMAYO:

Approximately, yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Is that a fair number?

MR. DEMAYO:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

And what do you anticipate coming in with the culinary institute?

MR. DEMAYO:

I'm not sure what the enrollment projection is for Culinary Arts, but I know that the space provided in Riverhead would be primarily for that function, whereas the library project is to serve the existing student population that's at the Eastern Campus.

LEG. KENNEDY:

The students in the culinary institute will have need to utilize the library or no?

MR. DEMAYO:

I'm not sure what their need will be, but certainly it would be available to them since they would be enrolled with the college.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Just to make it clear, the library is to serve the students that take the classes there.

MR. DEMAYO:

The existing students that are enrolled at the Eastern Campus, yes.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

And we do have snowy days and ugly days, and the library does need to be where they're going to school.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Just one last thing, I guess, as far as looking at the two things. When do you anticipate the culinary institute opening?

MR. DEMAYO:

I don't believe this coming semester, because it has to be bid, then constructed. So there would

be certainly some construction schedule I would imagine, at least six to nine months.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. All right.

LEG. FOLEY:

Madam Chair.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Just a clarification.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

A clarification.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Keep in mind, the culinary school, we are not building. It's in a design build. We are going to lease the space from a builder who's going to put up a building. Is it convert a building or build a new building?

LEG. LINDSAY:

It's a new building.

LEG. KENNEDY:

They're going to take down the old Sweezy's.

LEG. LINDSAY:

But it isn't a County project?

MR. DEMAYO:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So it's a private outfit that's going to construct it, but we are going to lease it and operate ••

LEG. LINDSAY:

It's a lease•back. It's a lease•back that we use a lot.

LEG. KENNEDY:

All right.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Legislator Foley.

LEG. FOLEY:

Thank you, Madam Chair. With all the emphasis on the Eastern Campus and certainly reflective of the eastward migration of population in the County, there needs to be attentions there. However, and even though, let's say, we do have the College's engineering staff here, but I don't see many from the top echelons of the administration, but the fact remains that to this day, that the Ammerman Campus alone is larger then 80% of the community colleges in the country and that there's still some outstanding needs on the Ammerman Campus that have not •• that are not part of the Capital Program, one of which •• as we all know, right now there's about, correct me if I'm wrong, anywhere from a 94 to a 98% utilization rate of classroom space at Ammerman.

When you couple that with the fact that the •• that the largest growing school districts are in Brookhaven Township, that is most of whom •• most of which have a sizeable number of students who then matriculate to the Ammerman Campus, not to the Eastern Campus, and over next five •• as much as it's a problem now with that kind of utilization rate, I would say, Madam Chair, and this will be after my time and Legislator Bishop's time, and given the five year cycle at the minimum that the state has, there's going to be a huge pressing need for at least one additional classroom building on Ammerman given the great increase expected in the Sachem School District, Longwood, Patchogue•Medford, Middle Country, South Country, Eastport, throughout particularly central and eastern Brookhaven Town where many of those students will

be attending the Community College, and they're not going to be ready five years from now.

So I would •• you know, whether it's through •• I'll give serious thought of trying to put something in the budget somewhere in the three year program, but for those Legislators who will be here after this year, you have to give a lot of serious thought about the needs of Ammerman, because quite rightly the Western Campus, there had to be an emphasis there. That was attended to particularly under Sal LaLima's tenure, and now there's talk about the Eastern Campus. But the fact remains by sheer numbers and by the growth in the school districts that are main feeder districts to the Community College, it is still the Ammerman Campus by sheer numbers that's the largest to this day and will be for many years forward. And with a 98% utilization rate, you're going to lose students who won't be going to the college, you're going to be losing students who had initially registered for classes, but then those classes were cancelled what they call units. But the fact remains that there's huge building needs on the that campus, which this budget only partially addresses.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Thank you, Legislator Foley. I just want to mention that at our last committee meeting, in all fairness, President Pippins was here with a complete presentation, very thorough, Kevin Peterman was here, Tom Breeden was here, and we really went through this issue by issue. And we really learned a lot that day.

LEG. FOLEY:

Good. Good.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Just so that's on the record. Now if there are no other questions •• are you finished with your presentation?

MR. DEMAYO:

All set. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Is there anybody else that wants to be heard for this meeting? Ellen Schuler•Mauk. We have a Parks Meeting starting at two o'clock. Hi.

MS. SCHULER•MAUK:

My name is Ellen Schuler•Mauk, and I'm president of the Faculty Association at Suffolk Community College. And I just have some information perhaps to supplement some of the responses to the questions that were asked by Legislator Kennedy. The enrollment at the Eastern Campus in the fall of this year was almost 3000 students, and that does not •• you know, obviously that doesn't count for the kind of growth that we expect in the culinary institute. While our culinary institute will be in the downtown area and it's designed so that there will be kind of a bakery open to public so that it will be kind of a town grown opportunity, the students in that program are not only going to be studying in that program.

Obviously when they're dealing with the culinary aspects of their program, they'll be in that

building, but they will be taking other courses at the Eastern Campus. They will have the need for the library services that is also part of the Capital Project. The •• just to give you some perspective in terms of the Eastern Campus Library. The Eastern Campus Library space was the original space that the Eastern Campus had in 1978. And at that time, if I can do kind of a rough calculation, I think •• well, in 1977, the Eastern Campus had 1500 students, only 450 of whom were full•time students. And since that time, obviously we've grown considerably out there, but the space is exactly the same. It's not as large as this auditorium, which is not a good state of affairs, especially when you think of a college library. So I wanted to provide that perspective in terms of the need for the library and also the need for the culinary institute.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Madam Chair. Ellen, thank you. I appreciate that clarification. But then in the culinary institute you anticipate for that first season starting up, 100 students, 150? Is there any kind of projection?

MS. SCHULER•MAUK:

I'm not sure exactly how many additional students. We do a small culinary program now that has probably between 50 and 80 students that are working at the Eastern Campus, and they're working in the cafeteria there. So obviously, they anticipate that the same number of students will go to new building. But obviously, with the new facilities, it will be more attractive to attract, you know, other students.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Okay. Thank you. This meeting is adjourned.

(* THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 2:09 P.M. *)

_ _ DENOTES BEING SPELLED PHONETICALLY